

REMARKS

Claims 13-16, 18-22, 24-29, 31-35 and 37-38 remain in the present application. Claims 13, 15-16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28-29, 31, 33, 35 and 37 are amended herein. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim amendments. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

Examiner Interview Summary

A telephonic Examiner Interview was conducted on October 23, 2008 between Examiner Cory Almeida and Applicants' representatives Bryan M. Failing and Anthony C. Murabito. The 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of independent Claim 13 was discussed with respect to the Witehira reference. It was agreed that Witehira does not appear to teach or suggest the combination of elements, for example, including "wherein said first region comprises an area less than the entire area of said first display screen" and "wherein a position of said second region on said second display screen is aligned with a position of said first region on said first display screen to selectively control an amount of light in the localized area of said first region" as recited in independent Claim 13, and similarly recited in independent Claims 20, 26 and 33. Applicants thank the Examiner for granting the interview.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 13-15, 19-21, 25-28, 32-34 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by United States Patent Number 6,906,762 to Witehira et al. (referred to herein as “Witehira”). It was agreed during the Examiner Interview that Witehira does not appear to teach or suggest the combination of elements, for example, including “wherein said first region comprises an area less than the entire area of said first display screen” and “wherein a position of said second region on said second display screen is aligned with a position of said first region on said first display screen to selectively control an amount of light in the localized area of said first region” as recited in independent Claim 13, and similarly recited in independent Claims 20, 26 and 33. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that independent Claims 13, 20, 26 and 33 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Witehira. Since Claims 14-15, 19, 21, 25, 27-28, 32, 34 and 38 depend from and recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 14-15, 19, 21, 25, 27-28, 32, 34 and 38 are also neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Witehira. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 13-15, 19-21, 25-28, 32-34 and 38 are allowable.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 16, 22, 29 and 35

Claims 16, 22, 29 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Witehira. Since Claims 16, 22, 29 and 35 depend from and

recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 16, 22, 29 and 35 are not rendered obvious by Witehira. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 16, 22, 29 and 35 are allowable.

Claims 18, 24, 31 and 37

Claims 18, 24, 31 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Witehira in view of United States Patent Number 6,388,648 to Clifton et al. (referred to herein as “Clifton”). Applicants respectfully submit that Clifton also fails to teach or suggest the combination of elements, for example, including “wherein said first region comprises an area less than the entire area of said first display screen” and “wherein a position of said second region on said second display screen is aligned with a position of said first region on said first display screen to selectively control an amount of light in the localized area of said first region” as recited in independent Claim 13, and similarly recited in independent Claims 20, 26 and 33. Since Claims 18, 24, 31 and 37 depend from and recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 18, 24, 31 and 37 are not rendered obvious by Witehira in view of Clifton. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 18, 24, 31 and 37 are allowable.

General Remarks

The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or dependent claims are not further discussed as the above-discussed limitations are believed

to be sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art of record. However, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to respond to one or more of the Examiner's rejections in subsequent amendments should conditions arise warranting such responses.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 13-16, 18-22, 24-29, 31-35 and 37-38 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 12 / 9 / 2008

/BMF/

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060